

## **REMARKS**

As a preliminary matter, applicants appreciate the courtesy extended to Patrick Burns in a telephonic interview on July 8, 2008. No agreement was reached, but the examiner made some suggestions as to claim amendments which would likely avoid at least JP '338 and JP '609. The examiner's suggestions in that regard have been adopted, by amending the independent claims to define circular loop portions that terminate without making a complete circle.

Applicants submit that JP '777 also does not disclose or suggest this feature of the present invention. During the interview, the examiner discussed paragraph 9 of JP '777, and applicants' attorney suggested that a more reliable translation might be helpful in this regard. In any event, the present translation of JP '777 merely suggests that the configuration may not necessarily be a perfect configuration, and discloses an elliptical configuration. Both of these are different than the present invention, which includes circular loop portions terminating without making a complete circle, with the recited reformed portions between adjacent circular loop portions. Accordingly, withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claims 1, 3, 5 and 14 (paragraph 5 of the office action mailed 4/4/08) is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 14 also stand rejected under § 102 on the basis of Adams US '411. Applicants traverse this rejection because Adams does not disclose (or suggest) the reformed portions of the present claims. Adams merely discloses a triangular portion without reformed portions. Without the reformed portions of the present invention, it is difficult to

stably maintain a flat coil form configuration having circular loop portions partly plied successively one on top of the other. As a result of this, the quality of a rubber product made with the reinforcement members of Adams tends to be unstable. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claim 4 stands rejected under § 103 on the basis of JP '338 and Sidles '100, or alternatively, JP '609 and Sidles or JP '777 and Sidles. Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons previously given and the following reason, as well.

The elongation (E) of the cord in Sidles refers to the ratio of the cord length  $l_f$  to an original cord length  $l_o$  at the point of modulus transition (as calculated according to the expression recited in col. 4, line 5). That is to say, it defines the extension of the cord at the modulus transition point, but not the elongation at a tensile load of 10N. The invention of Sidles relates to a particular cord which is provided by winding an inextensible yarn helically around an elastic core material. Thus, the invention of Sidles does not relate to a cord with or in which no clear modulus transition point exists under the condition of a low stress application (see Fig. 5 on file), as in claim 4. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is also requested.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants believe that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicants' attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

Patrick G. Burns  
Registration No. 29,367

August 1, 2008

300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312.360.0080  
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

Customer No. 24978